



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STUDIES IN THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL

BY M. H. SEGAL, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

II

THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK *

(concluded)

THE FIRST PERIOD OF DAVID'S REIGN OVER ALL ISRAEL.

87. THE section comprised by chs. 5-8 contains accounts of events, most, but not all, of which occurred in the first period of David's reign over all Israel. The section is the original work of our author, though here and there he seems to have incorporated some old material. Thus, for example, 5. 6-8 reads like an excerpt from an older source. Such excerpts may exist in other parts of ch. 5 and in ch. 8. The section may also contain here and there later additions. Such is, perhaps, the chronological notice in 5. 4-5 (cf. 1 Kings 2. 11), the expansion in 7. 22-4, and the statement in 8. 11-12.

88. (ch. 5.) Critics consider 5. 3 to be a duplicate of vers. 1-2. But the statement in ver. 3 is not identical with the statement in the two previous verses, but is rather its sequel and necessary consequence. The three verses describe the two stages of the transference of Saul's throne to David: first a popular embassy representing all the

* Concluded from vol. VIII, pp. 75 ff.

tribes that came to Hebron and offered the throne to David (vers. 1-2). When David had accepted the throne, the elders of Israel followed to Hebron, and concluded a covenant with David (cf. 2 Kings 11. 17 b), whereupon they anointed him as their king.

The critics may be right in declaring vers. 4-5 to be a later addition. On the other hand, vers. 13-16 may very well belong to our author, who sought to enhance the impression of David's prosperity and might by recounting the increase in his harem and the number of his sons (cf. above, § 82). Vers. 11-12 are held by some critics to belong to the latter part of David's reign, since Hiram is found to be still alive in the reign of Solomon. But it is quite possible that Hiram outlived David by many years. Further, the building of David's royal palace should in all probability be assigned to the earlier part of his residence in Jerusalem, when, as we are told in ver. 9 b, David was engaged in great building enterprises. And, as H. P. Smith observes (*op. cit.*, 289), the alliance between Hiram and David may have been directed against their common enemy, the Philistines, which would place its formation before the destruction of the Philistine power. That the statement in ver. 11 is true is rendered very probable by the express declaration in 1 Kings 5. 15 b (against S. A. Cook, *op. cit.*, 151).

89. Budde (*op. cit.*, 243) and his followers place vers. 17-25 immediately after ver. 3 (or ver. 5), vers. 6-12 after ch. 6. 1, and vers. 13-16 after ch. 8. 14. But we must reiterate the already oft-repeated question: How and why did the present arrangement arise? Further, it is quite evident that וַאֲנָשֵׁי in ver. 6 cannot refer to the levy of the 30,000 mentioned in ch. 6. 1, for the expression is almost

a technical term for David's veterans and immediate followers; cf. 2. 3; I 23. 5, 12, 13, &c.; 24. 3, 23; 27. 3, 8; 29. 2, 11; 30. 1, 3. A host of 30,000 would be described as העם, as in 6. 2, or בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, as in 6. 5. It is also very unlikely that David would have used such a vast host for the investment of Jerusalem.⁴³ Finally, if 6. 2 is the immediate continuation of 5. 12, then the phrase וְכָל הָעָם אֲשֶׁר אִתּוֹ will be without a direct antecedent, and quite obscure. Surely David did not keep with him 30,000 people throughout the events described in 5. 9-12. There can be no doubt whatever that 6. 2 is the immediate continuation of 6. 1. David raised that host in order to bring up the Ark with full military honours. For the military character of the Ark cf. 11. 11; I 4. 3; Num. 10. 35-6, &c.

90. As regards the transference of vers. 17-25 to ver. 3, we may remark that the critics repeat here the error which we have already noted before (§ 25, &c.), of forcing their own modern views upon the ancient writer. The modern view is, no doubt correctly, that the greatest achievement of David's reign was the subjugation of the Philistines, and that this achievement did more than anything else to consolidate his kingdom and to secure the national existence of Israel. But this need not necessarily have been the view of the ancient historian. In his time the Philistines were an insignificant people which had for generations been subject to Judah. It was therefore hard for him to realize fully the place which the Philistine struggle had occupied in the reigns of Saul and David. The conquest of Jerusalem, the building of Zion and of David's royal residence, and the acquisition by David of a large harem and so many sons, were, in the eyes of our author, of far

⁴³ Cf. H. P. Smith, *op. cit.*, 388.

greater consequence for the consolidation of David's throne, and a far more striking proof of the favour with which God regarded the accession of David (ver. 12) than the destruction of the power of the Philistines and their subjection to Israel. Hence the account of David's anointment over all Israel is followed immediately by the conquest of Jerusalem and the kindred achievements described in vers. 6-16, all of which are intended to illustrate the statements in vers. 10, 12.

91. There is also another good reason why our author did not follow the strict chronological order and place vers. 17 ff. immediately after ver. 3 (ver. 5). There is no doubt that the campaign described in vers. 17-21 must have taken place immediately after David's anointment in ver. 3. This is expressly stated in ver. 17 a α, where, moreover, there is no mention of the conquest of Jerusalem. Further, there is no doubt, as Wellhausen has rightly observed, that it is this campaign which is referred to in 23. 11 ff., and that *המצודה* in ver. 17 b is identical with the *מצודה* of Adullam mentioned in 23. 14. All this presupposes that David was still at Hebron. For had he been already at Jerusalem, he would certainly not have abandoned that strong fortress to take refuge in the wilds of the borderland. On the other hand, the second campaign described in vers. 22-5 must have taken place after the conquest of Jerusalem. For if, for some strategical reason unknown to us, the Philistines stationed themselves in the Valley of Rephaim for the first battle, it is very strange that they should have returned for the second battle to the same place of their great defeat, unless David had meanwhile occupied Jerusalem, and it had become important for them to dislodge him from his strong position. We may thus assume with

a certain degree of confidence that vers. 6-9, and perhaps also ver. 11, took place after the first campaign (vers. 17-21), and that ch. 6 took place some time later than the second campaign (vers. 22-5). Hence, the writer says in 6. 1: 'וַיִּסַּף (= וַיִּאֲסֹף) עוֹר דָּ' viz. after the levy raised for the war in 5. 22-5. But as the author was evidently unwilling to separate his two brief notices of David's wars against the Philistines by the insertion between them of other material of a different nature, he was therefore obliged to abandon the chronological order. And so he chose first to give his notice of the conquest of Jerusalem and of the related events in vers. 6-16, in order to illustrate David's prosperity and the favour shown him by God (vers. 10, 12), and then to give the accounts of the two Philistine campaigns together, and immediately after the story of the bringing up of the Ark (ch. 6), which, as we have remarked, followed the second Philistine campaign.

92. (ch. 7.) Chapter 7 is clearly the continuation of ch. 6. Having brought the Ark to Jerusalem, David wishes to erect for it a suitable habitation which might become the central sanctuary of the kingdom. Ver. 2 a refers back to 5. 11, and ver. 2 b to 6. 17. The use of the perfect consecutive with the verbs in vers. 9 b-11 proves that David was still in the earlier part of his reign, and that, therefore, the statement in ver. 1 b must be taken in a relative and not in an absolute sense. The facts that the prophet is represented as not being cognizant of God's real purpose (ver. 3), that the value of the Temple is rather minimized in the prophecy,⁴⁴ that the author is favourable to the Davidic dynasty and is ignorant of its decay and fall, all tend to prove the early age of our chapter. Hence

⁴⁴ Cf. R. Kittel in Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift*³, 429.

we see no reason to deny its composition to our author. The style differs indeed from the rest of the book, but this may be due to the different character of the subject-matter, which demanded a certain conventional and standardized treatment—cf. our observation on I 12 (§ 42). The critics, however, are almost unanimous that the chapter is an interpolation, though they are far from unanimous on the question of its date, some regarding it as pre-Deuteronomic, others as post-Deuteronomic, and others again as exilic. Their view of its late origin is based chiefly on the assumption that vers. 12–15 refer to the long line of David's descendants, and not to a particular individual. As all prophecies are in the eyes of our critics *vaticinia post eventus*, it follows that this prophecy must have been written towards the end, or even after the end, of the Davidic dynasty. But the truth is that vers. 12–15 refer to no one else except to Solomon, cf. Yalkut, Rashi, and Kimḥi, *ad loc.* This is plainly stated in ver. 13, and also reiterated in 1 Kings 5. 19; 8. 17–20, where Solomon is actually made to quote the language of our ver. 13 as referring to himself. Cf. also 1 Chron. 22. 9–10; 28. 6–7. In spite, however, of this weighty and decisive evidence, Wellhausen (*op. cit.*, 254–5) and his followers persist in their view, declaring v. 13 to be an interpolation based upon a mistaken exegesis of our prophecy. These critics claim to know the meaning of our Scriptures better than their authors themselves. It may be asked whether the passages in 1 Kings are also to be condemned as the work of an interpolator who followed the spurious ver. 13 of our chapter? Or, where else could the reiterated story of a prediction about Solomon building the Temple, given in the passages in the First of Kings quoted above,

have been derived from? Apart, however, from this external evidence so thoughtlessly impugned by the critics, it is plain from its use as a singular right throughout the passage, that *וְרַעַךְ* in ver. 12 is a real singular, and not a collective, and that, therefore, it must refer to one single individual, viz. Solomon.⁴⁵ If *וְרַעַךְ* had been intended as a collective plural it would have been used as a real plural in accordance with Hebrew idiom (see Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Heb. Gram.*, § 145 b, and cf., for example, Gen. 15. 13, 14; 17. 7, 8, 9, &c.). Ver. 13 is obviously connected with the cited passages of 1 Kings, while ver. 14 points forward to 1 Kings 11. 11, 23, &c.; cf. 1 Chron. 22. 9; 28. 6. Psalms 89. 30-38; 132. 12 cannot be adduced as evidence for the correctness of the critics' interpretation of vers. 12, 15, for there the application of our prophecy to the Davidic dynasty is simply a case of poetic or homiletical licence. In the same way the Psalmist applies to David our ver. 14, which certainly does not refer to David himself (89. 27).

93. (ch. 8.) The author concludes his narrative of the first period of David's reign by a summary of David's conquests. As we shall show later, some of the events recorded in the brief paragraphs of this chapter really belong to the second period of David's reign, the story of which is given in chs. 9 ff. Our author, however, preferred placing them here rather than interpolating them in the document which he embodied in his book from chs. 9 ff. 8. 11-12 may perhaps be a later addition, like the similar addition in LXX to ver. 8, and 1 Chron. 8. 18; cf. 1 Chron. 29. 2 ff. Note also the late expression *כִּבְשׁ* in ver. 11.⁴⁶ Vers. 15-18 are not, as the critics hold, the

⁴⁵ For the application of *וְרַעַךְ* to one particular individual cf. Gen. 4. 25.

⁴⁶ Cf. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, 255.

conclusion of a document of a life of David, any more than the parallel passage in 20. 23-6 is the conclusion of the document chs. 9-20. For, as it is generally admitted, chs. 9-20 are continued in 1 Kings, chs. 1-2. 8. 15-18 form only the conclusion to the history of the first period of David's reign, contained in chs. 5-8. In a similar way, 20. 23-6 forms the conclusion to the history of the second period of David's reign contained in chs. 9-20. Cf. also above, § 49, and below, § 108.

94. The critics hold that the Aramean campaign described in vers. 3-6 is identical with the campaign described in 10. 6 ff., and that our account here is really borrowed from ch. 10. The differences between the two accounts are explained by Budde (*op. cit.*, 250), in a characteristic fashion, as deliberate alterations (the more correct expression would be 'falsifications') by the redactor for the purpose of concealing the source of his narrative and the identity of the two accounts. Thus in 8. 2 Ammon—who was really the cause of the whole Aramean War, as stated in ch. 10—is altered into Moab, with whom David was really on the most friendly terms, as shown by I 22. 3. *בית רחוב* in vers. 3, 12 is a deliberate alteration for *בית רחוב*, 10. 6. The account of the defeat and conquest of Damascus (vers. 5-6), which is historically 'highly improbable', is a redactional substitution for the account of the subjugation of the trans-Euphratean Arameans in 10. 16-18. The homage of To'i in vers. 9-10 is transferred here from the end of ch. 10. And, finally, the redactor deliberately deleted the name of Hadad'ezer from 10. 6, in order to conceal the dependence of his own account in 8. 3 ff. on ch. 10. It will be seen that, according to this critic, the redactor has falsified names, fabricated a story of David's cruelty

towards his former friends and hosts, the Moabites, tampered with his documents, altered them, mutilated them, and transposed them at his own will and pleasure. He committed all these literary crimes with a view to hiding the identity or similarity of the two accounts in ch. 8 and ch. 10. Yet all his efforts have proved an absolute futility, for all his artifices and misdeeds have now been fully laid bare by this lynx-eyed critic.

Let us, however, examine the assertions of this and other critics, and see whether they are really justified.

95. It is alleged that Moab in ver. 2 is a wilful alteration for the original Ammon, since David could not have fought against the king of Moab, owing to their old friendship. Now, it is true that David's hostility towards the Moabites is rather surprising, and the ancients⁴⁷ already sought for an explanation of its cause. But our ignorance of the cause for this hostility does not justify us in tampering with our text, or in accusing its ancient author of deliberate falsification. There is no doubt that our text is correct. We know that Moab continued in a state of vassalage to Israel until the great rebellion of Mesh'a (cf. 2 Kings 1. 1 ; 3. 4 ff., and the Moabite Stone). As there is no mention anywhere in our historical documents of another war between Israel and Moab until the reign of Jehoram, we are bound to conclude that Moab had been reduced to subjection at the beginning of the Israelitish monarchy, a conclusion which is fully confirmed by the prophecy in Num. 24. 17. Saul's war against Moab (I 14. 47) does not seem to have been of a decisive character, since in I 22. 3-4 Moab is still found existing as an independent kingdom. It follows, therefore, that it

⁴⁷ Cf. *Bamidbar rabba*, ch. 14 ; Rashi and Kimḥi, *ad loc.*

must have been David who destroyed Moab's independence as stated in our text. Cf. also 23. 20, which probably belongs to this campaign.

96. Again, we are told that בן רחוב is a deliberate substitution for בית רחוב. Does the critic assert that the original had this absurdity: הדרעזר בית רחוב? And if we should go further and 'emend' it into 'הר, כְּבִית רחוב, there will still remain the difficulty that Hadad'ezer really belonged to Zobah and not to Beth Rehob. It may, however, be asked what is wrong with בֶּן רחוב? A personal name רחוב is found in Neh. 10. 12; cf. also the names רחב, רחביה, רחבעם. The truth is that the critics must find fault with 'בן ר' in order to be able to identify it with 'בית ר' in 10. 6 f. Further, we are told by Budde that the permanent occupation of Damascus by the Israelites is 'höchst unwahrscheinlich'. But our omniscient critic seems to have forgotten the clear statement in 1 Kings 11. 23-5, which fully corroborates the truth of our account that David had turned that ancient Syrian city into an Israelitish dependency.⁴⁸

97. The fact is that the Aramean campaign in this chapter is quite distinct from the one described in ch. 10, or, to be more precise, the campaign in 8. 3 ff. is really the sequel of the campaign of ch. 10. The origin of David's war against Hadad'ezer was the help the latter had offered to Ammon. The first campaign against him, described in ch. 10, resulted in the repeated defeat of himself and his

⁴⁸ This corroboration is not affected by the omission of LXX of בְּהַר דִּוֵּר אֲחָם in 1 Kings 11. 24. For it is evident from the context that the meaning of the passage is that the usurpation by Rezon of the throne of Damascus constituted an act of rebellion against Solomon, similar to that of Hadad the Edomite and Jeroboam the Ephraimite. Contrast Cheyne, *Ency. Bibl.*, I, 1028, n. 4.

vassals. The latter submitted to David and exchanged Hadad'ezer's suzerainty for that of David (10. 19). Hadad'ezer himself, though defeated, was not yet entirely broken. His final destruction David reserved for another opportunity, and this he found when Hadad'ezer undertook an expedition to the banks of the Euphrates.⁴⁹ It is this second campaign, resulting in the total defeat of Hadad'ezer and the subjugation of Damascus, which is described in our chapter.

98. The critics are surprised that the king of Zobah is not mentioned expressly in 10. 6, whereas in 10. 16 the name of Hadad'ezer is given, but without any epithet or description. They see in this also a proof of the activity of a dishonest or tampering redactor. But the explanation is quite simple. The omission of the mention of the king of Zobah in 10. 6 is due to the same cause as the omission of the mention of the king of Beth Rehob, viz. that, unlike the king of Ma'akah, these two kings did not accompany in person the mercenaries from their kingdoms who went to the help of Ammon. It would, therefore, have been incorrect to say that the Ammonites had hired the king of Beth Rehob and the king of Zobah. In 10. 16, however, it was Hadad'ezer himself who personally ordered the battle at Helam. He is, therefore, mentioned by name, but without any special epithet, since he is assumed to be already known to the reader from the author's own description in 8. 3.

⁴⁹ בלכחו in 8. 3 refers to Hadad'ezer, as rightly explained by Rashi and Kimḥi.

THE SECOND PERIOD OF DAVID'S REIGN OVER ALL ISRAEL.

99. It is generally conceded⁵⁰ that chs. 9-20, with their sequel in 1 Kings chs. 1 and 2, belong all to one document written by an author who was almost a contemporary of the men and events which he described. These chapters are closely interrelated. They also display a general uniformity of style and method of presentation and a unity of plan and conception. They seem to look at the events which they describe from a nearer perspective, and are undoubtedly older than other parts of our book. Hence we are led to the conclusion that our author incorporated this lengthy section from some older work, in the same way as he incorporated I 4-6; 9-10, 16, &c.

100. (ch. 9.) Budde and other critics maintain that ch. 9 is the sequel to 21. 1-14, for the inquiry of David in 9. 1 is only intelligible after the slaughter of Saul's house described in 21. 1-14. This view leads them to strike out 21. 7 as an interpolation and to place ch. 24 before 21. 1-14, and to delete 24. 1a as a redactional link. The plain man, however, will on the contrary accept 21. 7 as sufficient proof that ch. 9 is earlier than 21. 1-14. The

⁵⁰ There are, however, some exceptions to this consensus of opinion. Thus, the integrity of the whole of ch. 12 has been challenged by Schwally (see below), and notably by A. S. Cook (*AJSL.*, XVI, 145-177). The latter seeks to apply the redactional hypothesis to the whole of this section, without, however, developing a coherent and self-consistent theory of the composition of these chapters. The evidence for his rather startling conclusion is often of a purely subjective character, and in flagrant contradiction to the express statements of the text. We, therefore, forbear from entering fully into a discussion of his arguments.

critics themselves would not have been forced to this arbitrary and violent procedure if they had not pressed unduly the literalness of the expression נותר in 9. 1. The expression is sufficiently explained by the slaughter of Saul and his sons at Gilboa and the murder of Ishbosheth. On the other hand, a little consideration will at once prove the baselessness of the critics' theory. In his search for victims for the Gibeonites, David must have made full inquiry for the descendants of Saul. The first person mentioned as a likely victim would no doubt have been Mephibosheth, who was the only direct male descendant of Saul. If so, how could David have remained ignorant of the existence of Mephibosheth until after the tragedy of 21. 1-14? We must also reject H. P. Smith's conjecture that 7. 1 stood originally at the head of our chapter. For 7. 1 is the natural and necessary introduction to 7. 2. Cf. also 7. 11: והניחתי לך מכל איבך.

101. (ch. 11.) Some critics assert that the story of David and Bathsheba was originally independent of the story of the siege of Rabbah. But from 11. 7, 11. 15 ff. it is plain that the incident occurred while Joab and the army were engaged on the prolonged siege of a certain city. We have a record only of one such siege, viz. the siege of Rabbah. If those critics do not believe the ancient writer (or 'redactor'), it is plainly their duty to tell us with what other siege the story is connected.

Wellhausen (*op. cit.*, 259) holds ver. 21 to be an interpolation because the reference to Abimelek in the mouth of the king is 'an unnecessary piece of historical erudition'. But it is difficult to see why as a practical tactician David should not have mentioned this striking example of the risk which the besiegers ran by approaching too close to

the enemy's wall.⁵¹ Further, the critic has forgotten that the speech given in these verses is put into David's mouth by the narrator (cf. above, § 69). If the critic denies David the right of showing his historical erudition, he cannot surely deny such a right to the historian. One cannot help suspecting that the real objection of our critic to this verse is that it proves the great antiquity of the narrative in Judges ch. 9.

102. (ch. 12.) F. Schwally (*ZATW.*, 1892, pp. 153 ff.), followed by H. P. Smith (*op. cit.*, 322) and by W. Nowack in his commentary, declares 12. 1-15 a to be a late interpolation of the same date as ch. 7, which, he says, 'had been assigned by authoritative critics to the age of Josiah'. The only argument, however, which he advances in support of this theory is that no reference to Nathan's prediction of the death of the child is to be found in the subsequent paragraphs, vers. 15 b ff. But seeing that the narrator was writing history and not a dissertation on the truth of prophetic prediction, it is hard to understand why he was bound to repeat the fact of Nathan's rebuke and prediction. On the other hand, how can one understand David's conduct in vers. 16 ff. without the foregoing paragraph? Let us concede, for argument's sake, that the view of this critic is correct, and that God did not find anybody in Israel brave

⁵¹ Mr. Cook (*ibid.*, 156) asks, how else was the city to be taken, unless the army approached the wall? Evidently the narrator knew of other means besides exposing the besiegers to attacks from the wall, such as famine, undermining, or night attacks. He also finds an inconsistency between ver. 15, where David commands that Uriah alone should be placed in a position of danger, and vers. 17, 24, where others fell along with Uriah. But it is evident that Joab was not able to carry out David's order literally (cf. ver. 24, *כִּי נָבְרוּ עָלָינוּ*), and he took the first opportunity he could find for bringing about Uriah's death, viz. during a sortie by the enemy.

enough to communicate to the king the divine displeasure at his criminal action. David, then, like other potentates in pagan and Christian lands, could, and actually did, commit adultery and murder without bringing on himself any remonstrance whatever from the religious leaders of the day. But surely he himself must have felt in the depth of his heart that his conduct was contrary even to the morality of the 'Jahvism' of his own day, however crude and inarticulate it may have been according to our critics. How, then, could David have had the effrontery to fast and to pray to God for the recovery of the adulterous child without having first obtained God's pardon for his crime? Schwally is surprised that David does not display in vers. 16 ff. the contrition and humility of a penitent. But assuming that David had not been rebuked, and had not repented and been pardoned, our surprise ought to be greater still that David should have been so completely unconscious of his terrible sin, and that he should not have recognized in the death of the child a punishment for his crime. David's repose of mind in vers. 16 ff. can be explained only by his previous repentance and the prophet's assurance of God's complete pardon.

103. Schwally is shocked by the worldly character of Nathan as displayed in 1 Kings ch. 1, and he therefore concludes that Nathan was not a prophet at all, but merely some intriguing and ambitious courtier. Only a later generation, when prophets had become so prominent in public life, had felt the need of having some prophet associated with David's reign, and so turned the worldly Nathan into a prophet, and ascribed to him the prophecies of our chapter and ch. 7. In consequence our critic boldly strikes out הנביא wherever it occurs as an epithet of Nathan

in 1 Kings 1. One may add that by such a method our critic might have gone further and theorized that Zadok was not a priest at all, and that the epithet הכהן applied to him side by side with הנביא applied to Nathan should be struck out as a late insertion. We will not cite as evidence ch. 7 and 12. 25, for the critic may reject it as insufficient to upset his critical hypothesis. But, we ask, if Nathan was not the great prophet of the day, what else was he? How did he secure the commanding position at David's court which we find him occupying in 1 Kings ch. 1? Why should Adonijah have invited him to his banquet along with Solomon, Zadok, and Benajah (1 Kings 1. 10, 26)? Why, moreover, should David have demanded his assistance at Solomon's anointment? (*ibid.*, vers. 32 ff.). One cannot help expressing one's astonishment at the superficiality and the frivolous scepticism displayed by such 'critical' theories, and one's amazement that such absurdities should be written, published, and copied by academic scholars of repute.

104. But Mr. A. S. Cook (*op. cit.*, 157) goes even further than his German *confrère*. He boldly declares the whole of 11. 27 b-12. 24 a, 25 to be an interpolation. The whole story of the death of the adulterous child is a pure fiction. The child did not die, but lived and grew up to become king over Israel in the person of the illustrious King Solomon. And so that great and wise king, the builder of the Temple, the recipient of divine revelations, the reputed author of two or three biblical books, who is one of the chief heroic figures in history, was really a bastard, conceived in adultery and murder! We refuse to believe it. We refuse to believe that the moral consciousness of Israel in that great age had sunk so low as to suffer,

without a protest, a person of such an origin to sit on the national throne.

105. Budde's conjecture that vers. 7 b-9 a α (to בעינו) is an interpolation has been shown by H. P. Smith (*op. cit.*, 324) to be without foundation. But it must be admitted that Nathan's speech has undergone some amplification. The terrible threat in vers. 11-12 is probably an insertion by a later scribe, who saw in 16. 21-2 a punishment for David's sin with Bathsheba. Further, the double mention in vers. 9-10 of Uriah's murder and of David's marrying his widow cannot be original. Smith (*ibid.*) regards את בויחני אוריה . . . (vers. 9 a β -10 b α) as an interpolation. But it is not likely that the prophet would fail to mention the murder of Uriah. It is true that there is nothing in the parable corresponding to this crime. In order to be quite parallel to the application, the parable should have stated that the rich man slew the poor man before taking possession of his lamb. But, on the other hand, it is not necessary that a parable should agree in detail with the application.⁵² Thus, for example, the parable of Jotham (Judges 9. 8-20) and the parable of the Prophet (1 Kings 20. 39-42) do not correspond in every particular with their applications. In order to fulfil its purpose and impress the hearer with its beauty and truth, the parable must be an independent story and capable of standing by itself. This would not be the case if it were to agree in all details with its application, and serve only as a mask to another story. In spite, therefore, of the absence in the parable of a parallel to Uriah's murder, we may be sure that the prophet mentioned this deed together with the rape of Bathsheba, but only once and not twice, as our present text has it. Hence

⁵² Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judges*, p. 245.

we conjecture that Nathan's speech in the application ended with ver. 9 a (to לאשה), and that ver. 9 b is really the continuation of ver. 10, erroneously transposed. The whole of ver. 10 *plus* 9 b is an interpolation similar to the following vers. 11–12. Note that ver. 10 b (כי בוייתי . . .) is really a duplicate of ver. 9 a (בויית . . .). דבר should be omitted, with Lucian, as an anti-anthropomorphic paraphrase of 'ה,⁵³ and was probably added by the hand that inserted the threat in 10 a. We may add that it is rather surprising that the prophet makes no mention of David's adultery with Bathsheba prior to their legal marriage implied in לקחת לך לאשה.

106. (chs. 14–20.) There is no cogent reason for condemning 14. 26 as an interpolation. Our narrator is fond of such picturesque details, cf. 9. 10 b; 12. 30 a; 13. 18 a, &c. Moreover, the description of Absalom's personal beauty may be intended to explain his father's fondness for him (cf. 1 Kings 1. 6. See H. P. Smith, *op. cit.*, 338), and also the ease with which he gained the people's heart (15. 6). The richness of his hair may have been emphasized by the narrator as a preparation for 18. 9 b.⁵⁴ The mention of a royal standard weight is not necessarily a proof of the late origin of the passage. For even if we assume that the weight was of Babylonian origin, it is quite possible that the weight had been adopted in Canaan in the pre-Israelitish period. The originality of this description of Absalom's beauty is supported by the narrator's statement of the other pretender—Adonijah—גם הוא טוב (1 Kings 1. 6), which evidently refers to the beauty

⁵³ דבר ה' is an exact reproduction of the Aramaic מימרא דה' which is commonly employed in the Targumim to paraphrase the divine Name.

⁵⁴ Cf. Mishnah, *Soṭah*, I, 8.

of Absalom described in our verse. 14. 27 seems indeed to contradict 18. 18 a β . But it is hard to see how a later writer would have dared to insert such a contradictory statement without some explanation. Perhaps his three sons died before his rebellion.⁵⁵

107. 15. 24 must be taken, with the critics, as a gloss similar to I 6. 15. On the other hand, 18. 15 is undoubtedly original. There is no reason why a later writer should invent such a statement. It would seem that Absalom did not expire immediately,⁵⁶ and as Joab must have thought it dangerous to leave him to die slowly, he therefore ordered his armour-bearers to dispatch him at once. The fact that Joab is given here ten armour-bearers, as compared with the one possessed by Saul and Jonathan, need occasion no surprise. In the high state of development to which the military profession had attained in David's reign, it is quite possible that the commander-in-chief of the army was followed by ten young men of noble birth who acted as his pages or squires.

108. 20. 23-6 forms the conclusion of the story of the second period of David's reign, as 8. 16-18 formed the conclusion of the story of the first period (cf. above, § 93). Like those verses, our passage here must be by the author of our book, who broke off here with his borrowed document in order to give chs. 21 ff. Observe the addition to the list of officers of Adoram (ver. 24), who held his office till after the death of Solomon (1 Kings 12. 18), and must therefore have been appointed at the end of David's reign. Observe further that the sons of David, who had become discredited through the conduct of their brothers Amnon

⁵⁵ Cf. Babli Soṭah 11 a, and Kimḥi and Ralbag, *ad loc.*

⁵⁶ בלב אבשלום in ver. 14, like בלב האלה, must not be taken literally.

and Absalom, no longer act as the king's domestic priests (cf. 8. 18 b), and their place is taken by עִירָא. It is also possible that שִׁיָּא is not to be identified with שְׂרִיָּא of 8. 17. These considerations confirm the view that our list here belongs to a later period than the one in 8. 16-18, and dispose of the theory of the critics that our passage is merely a redactional rehash of 8. 16-18. See also Sayce, *Early History of Hebrews*, p. 444.

MISCELLANEOUS PIECES, chs. 21-4.

109. The last four chapters of our book consist of a series of six miscellaneous pieces, viz. (1) The story of the expiation of Saul's slaughter of the Gibeonites, 21. 1-14; (2) Exploits of four heroes of David against four champions of the Philistines, 21. 15-22; (3) David's Hymn of Triumph, ch. 22; (4) David's Oracle, 23. 1-7; (5) A list of David's heroes and some of their exploits, 23. 8-39; (6) David's census of the people and its consequences, ch. 24. It is generally agreed that (1) and (6) probably belong to one document, the latter being originally the continuation of the former, as is shown by 24. 1 a, which can refer only to the calamity in 21. 1. Likewise (2) and (5) belong together, and (3) and (4) are obviously also of a similar nature. Further, we may also accept the theory of the critics that 1 Kings ch. 1-2 belong to the same document as 2 Sam. chs. 9-20, the former being the direct continuation of the latter, though it is also quite possible that in the original document some other material intervened between 2 Sam. 20 and 1 Kings 1-2. But we cannot accept the view of the critics that the whole of this section comprised in chs. 21-4 was added by later hands as an appendix to the book after its separation from 1 Kings. The insertion

of the list of officers in 20. 23-6, which, as we have shown above, emanates from the author of our book who had incorporated into his work the old document, chs. 9-20, leads us to think that it was made of a set purpose, in order to mark a break in the narrative, and to prepare the reader for other accounts different in their source and nature from the preceding chapters. Hence we conclude that 21. 1-14 and its complement ch. 24 belong to our author. Whether these pieces are the author's original work, or have been borrowed by him from another document, it is impossible to decide with any degree of certainty. The subdued tone of these narratives and the mention in 21. 12 of מרחוב, instead of מחומת, as in I 31. 12, would lead one to the conclusion that they are not the author's own work. On the other hand, the parenthesis in 21. 2 b shows that the narrative is not very ancient. For an older writer would have thought it unnecessary to explain the character of the Gibeonites. It is not hard to explain why the author placed these narratives here, and not earlier in the book. 21. 7 shows that the famine took place after ch. 9 (cf. above, § 100). The author, therefore, had to place 21. 1-14 after ch. 9, but he probably did not like to interrupt the document, chs. 9-20, which he was transcribing into his own work, until he had reached a suitable place, viz. after the quelling of the rebellion of Absalom and Sheba'. Perhaps, as we have indicated above, ch. 21. 1 ff. took the place of some other narrative which stood in that document between 2 Sam. 20 and 1 Kings 1-2, and which our author failed to adopt into his own work.

110. 21. 1-14 and ch. 24 were torn asunder by the insertion of 21. 15-22, and its sequel 23. 8-39. The insertion of the exploits against the Philistines may have been

suggested by the mention of the Philistine victory over Saul in 21. 12 b. We are also inclined to think that the two poems, ch. 22 and 23. 1-17, were placed in their present position by the same hand which inserted 21. 15-22 and 23. 8-39. A scribe who did not shrink from tearing asunder 21. 1-14 and ch. 24 by the insertion of 21. 15-22; 23. 8-39 would surely not have had any compunction in separating his own description of David's heroes by the interpolation of chs. 22-23. 1-7. No doubt he thought that the most suitable place for the Hymn which celebrated David's victory over *all* his enemies (22. 1 b) was at the end of the book after all the accounts of David's wars against internal and external enemies, and after the description of the struggle against the Philistine champions, one of whom had actually sought to take David's own life (21. 16). The Oracle, with its promise of perpetuity and prosperity to David's dynasty (23. 5), was suggested by the concluding verse of the Hymn (22. 51).⁵⁷ It is also quite possible that the placing of the list of heroes (23. 8-39) after the poem was due to a pure accident. The interpolator may not have decided upon its incorporation until after he had already copied down the two poems. On the other hand, the whole insertion of 21. 15-23. 39 was placed where it stands, instead of at the end of ch. 24, because ch. 24 may have been considered a fitting conclusion to the whole book, since it closes with the divinely-ordained consecration of the site of the future Temple of Solomon, an act which in a later time was probably thought to have been the crowning achievement of David's career (cf. 1 Chron. 21. 3 ff.), and which at the same time served as an introduction to the story of Solomon's reign in 1 Kings. Finally, the

⁵⁷ Cf. *JQR.*, V, 201.

exploits against the Philistines (2I. 15 ff.) were not inserted earlier in the book, say after 5. 25—as Budde has done in his hotch-potch polychrome text—because the interpolator could not have placed there the Hymn in which, as we have said, David celebrated his triumph over all his enemies, Philistine as well as others, external as well as internal.

III. (ch. 2I.) 2I. 2 b-3 a α (to הַנְּבָעִיִּים) need not be an interpolation, as the critics assert. It may be merely an explanatory parenthesis by the author himself, similar to the parenthetical explanations in 4. 2 b f.; I 27. 8 b, &c. Ver. 12: מֵרָחוֹב may show, as we have remarked above (§ 109), that our passage is from a document different from I 3I. It does not, however, involve a contradiction to I 3I. 12, since the bodies suspended from the wall (= בְּחוֹמַת I 3I. 10) must have faced the broad place in front of the wall (= מֵרָחוֹב 2I. 12). Thus, both passages are quite correct and consistent. It is therefore quite possible that our passage here was incorporated into the book by the same author who wrote I 3I. The reading of the Targum for מְשׁוּרָא, and of some codd. of LXX ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους = מְחוֹמַת for מֵרָחוֹב, rests evidently on a deliberate correction.

I 12. 2I. 15-22 is similar in its compressed annalistic style to 5. 17-25. It differs, however, from that passage in its contents, since it does not deal, like 5. 17-25, with David's wars against the Philistines, but only with the exploits of individual warriors. In other words, instead of a narrative of the Philistine wars, including as episodes also accounts of individual exploits subordinate to the account of the wars, we have here accounts of the exploits forming the principal theme, and the wars mentioned only as something subordinate, and as affording a background

to the exploits. For this reason it is very much to be doubted whether our passage ever had any connexion with 5. 17-25. It is certainly wrong to transfer our passage to the end of ch. 5 without first explaining how the passage became dislocated from its original position and transposed here.

For a discussion of the text of chs. 22-23. 7 cf. this REVIEW, vol. V, pp. 209-31.

113. (ch. 23.) Many critics think that 23. 13-17, which according to ver. 13 a describes an exploit by members of the Thirty, was placed in its present position by an error, and that the conclusion of ver. 12 is ver. 17 b: 'אלה עשו וכו'. But it is hard to see how the passage was so misplaced. Again, the שלשת הגברים in ver. 16 a are evidently identical with the שלשת הגברים in ver. 17 b, viz. the Three enumerated in vers. 8-11, so that the exploit of vers. 13-17 was performed not by members of the Thirty, but by the Three of vers. 8-11. It is, therefore, more probable that for שלשים (שלשה Kêrê) in ver. 13 we should read השלשה or שלשתם, and omit מהשלשים as a corrupt dittography of the previous word. ראש may perhaps belong to קציר 'at the beginning of the harvest', as proposed by Budde. The original text would thus have read: וירדו השלשה (or שלשתם) ראש קציר ויבאו אל ד'. LXX and Peshiṭta omit ראש altogether, perhaps rightly.

114. The whole list contains thirty-six names, whereas the total is given in ver. 39 as thirty-seven. Various solutions have been offered to this difficulty (cf. also Kimḥi and Ralbag), but none can be deemed satisfactory. I conjecture that the name and achievements of one hero have fallen out by some accident after either ver. 19 or ver. 23. That hero may have been אחימלך החתי (I 26. 6) or אחי הנתי.

If so, there were really two sets of Three in addition to the Thirty (= Thirty-one). By adopting this conjecture we shall be able to retain the present text in vers. 18-19: 'Abishai . . . was the chief of השלשי (השלשה)', the second Three . . . ; 'he had a reputation בשלשה' among the first Three; (ver. 19) 'He was the most honourable of השלשה', the second Three; 'but did not attain to the rank of השלשה', the first Three.

115. (ch. 24.) The text of 24. 10-17 has been suspected by many critics. H. P. Smith rejects as interpolations ver. 10, because according to this verse 'David's repentance comes before his denunciation' (*op. cit.*, 390), and ver. 17, because 'ver. 18 joins immediately to ver. 16. . . . Neither in what follows nor in ver. 16 is any notice taken by Y" of this prayer' (*ibid.*, 391 f.). But as a matter of fact there was no denunciation at all by Gad, for the simple reason that no denunciation was necessary, since David was already conscious of his error before Gad had come to him. The prophet nowhere in the chapter tells David that he had sinned. It is David himself who cries חטאתי (vers. 10, 17). Budde re-arranges the text as follows: vers. 10, 11 b, 12, 13 b, 11 a, 13 a, 13 c (. . . עתה דע), 14, 15, 16 a, 17, 16 b, 18.⁵⁸ But we must ask the oft-repeated question: how did this complicated derangement arise, and from what cause? Further, a little consideration will show that the present wording of our text demands its present arrangement. If 11 b had followed immediately upon ver. 10, the statement would have been expressed in the usual fashion, thus: ויהי דבר ה' אל נר הנביא. The use of the pluperfect construction with היה shows that the event of the prophecy was anterior to some other event previously mentioned, viz.

⁵⁸ Cf. his text in Haupt's *SBOT.*, p. 35, and his notes, *ibid.*, p. 85.

to ver. 11a; for the prophetic word had come to Gad during the night before David had arisen in the morning.⁵⁹ Again, if ver. 13b had originally followed upon ver. 12, and had formed the exact wording of the divine message to Gad, it would not have been expressed in the form of three interrogative clauses, but rather in a simple enumeration of the three penalties, and would have been placed between ver. 12a and ver. 12b, thus: *שֶׁלֶשׁ אֲנֹכִי נוֹטֵל עֲלֶיךָ שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים רֹעֵב בְּאֶרֶץ שְׁלֹשָׁה חֳדָשִׁים . . . וְהוּא רֹדֵף וְשֹׁלֵשֵׁת יָמִים דָּבָר בְּאֶרֶץ בָּחַר לְךָ אֶחָת מֵהֶם וְכוּ'.* The present wording of ver. 13b shows that it is really Gad's own paraphrase of the divine message. Again, the order ver. 16a-16b is certainly original. For the purpose of the writer is to show the favour which God showed the Holy City, that as soon as the angel stretched forth his hand to strike her, God repented Himself of His own accord, and before David had uttered his prayer in ver. 17. The truth is that the difficulties raised by the critics are only of their own making. The arrangement of our text is quite logical and consistent. In spite of the warnings and protests of Joab, who no doubt represented the prevailing public opinion,⁶⁰ with which David himself agreed in the depth of his heart, the king yet persisted in carrying out his object. But that object attained, the inevitable reaction set in, and the king was stricken with remorse for what he had done, and apparently in the night time he prayed to God for forgiveness (ver. 10). The same night, and before the king had risen in the morning, the prophet Gad was charged by God with a message to the king to choose one of three evils as a penalty

⁵⁹ Cf. Driver's note, *ad loc.*

⁶⁰ Cf. 1 Chron. 21. 6; Rashi here to vers. 5-6, and Pesikṭa Rabbati, ed. Friedmann, p. 43b.

for his sin (vers. 11-13). David makes his choice, committing himself to the mercy of God (ver. 14). His trust in God was fully justified by the event. For as soon as the destroying angel had reached Jerusalem, and before the first of the three days had passed (ver. 15 a), God bethought Himself out of consideration for the Holy City (ver. 16). David, however, ignorant of the change in the divine purpose, offered up another prayer to spare the people (ver. 17). In answer to this second prayer Gad is again sent to him (ver. 18; cf. ver. 19 b), with a message from God, as he was sent to him before in answer to his first prayer (vers. 10-11).

116. Having now arrived at the end of our inquiry into the composition of our book, we will summarize the results we have obtained in the following table:

1. Author's original work:

I 1; 2. 11, 18-21, 26; 3; 4. 1 a (M. T.); 7. 2-17; 8; 10. 17-27; 11; 12; 14. 47-52; 15; 16; 18, 6 a β (... ותצאנה)—8 a, 9, 12 a, 13-16, 20-21 a, 22-6 a, 27-9 a; 19; 20. 1 a; 21. 2-16; 22; 23; 24; 25. 1, 2-42 (?), 43-4; 27; 28. 1-2, 3-17, 19 a β (... ומחר)—25; 29; 30; 31.

II 1. 1-18; 2. 1-9, 12-32; 3; 4; 5. 1-3, 4-5 (?), 10-25; 6; 7; 8. 1-10, 13-18; 20. 23-6; 21. 1-14 (?); 24 (?).

2. Old material incorporated by the author himself:

I 2. 12-17, 22-5, 27-31 a, 32-4, 35-6 (?); 4. 1 b-22; 5; 6. 1-14, 16-21; 7. 1; 9; 10. 1-16; 13. 2-23; 14. 1-46; 17. 1-11, 32-40, 42-8 a, 49, 51-4; 25. 2-42 (?); 26.

II 1. 19-27; 5. 6-9; 9; 10; 11; 12. 1-9 a, 13-31;
13; 14; 15. 1-23, 24 b-37; 16; 17; 18; 19; 20. 1-
22; 21. 1-14 (?); 24 (?).

3. Old additions found already in the archetype of LXX:

I 2. 1-10, 35-6 (?); 6. 15; 20. 1 b-42; 21. 1;
28. 18-19 a α.

II 2. 10-11; 5. 4-5 (?); 8. 11-12; 12. 9 b-12;
15. 24 a; 21. 15-22; 22; 23.

4. Late additions not found in archetype of LXX:

I 2. 22 b; 13. 1; 17. 12-14*, 15, 16-31*, 41, 48 b,
50, 55-8*; 18. 1-5*, 6 a, 8 b, 10-11*, 12 b, 17-19*,
21 b, 26 b, 29 b-30.⁶¹

⁶¹ Passages marked with an asterisk were derived by the interpolator from an old document. We have left out of consideration in this Conspectus the classification of certain disputed single words and phrases.